arXiv:1110.5553v1 [math.OC] 25 Oct 2011

On Necessary and Sufficient Conditions for Near-Optimal Singular Stochastic Controls

Mokhtar Hafayed[*]
Laboratory of Applied Mathematics, Mohamed Khider University,
Po Box 145, Biskra 07000, Algeria.

Syed Abbas[†]
School of Basic Sciences, Indian Institute of Technology Mandi,
Mandi-175001, India.

Petr Veverka[‡]
Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Nuclear Sciences and
Physical Engineering, Czech Technical University, Trojanova 13,
Prague 120 00, EU-Czech Republic.

October 26, 2011

Abstract

This paper is concerned with necessary and sufficient conditions for near-optimal singular stochastic controls for systems driven by a nonlinear stochastic differential equations (SDEs in short). The proof of our result is based on Ekeland's variational principle and some dilecate estimates of the state and adjoint processes. This result is a generalization of Zhou's stochastic maximum principle for near-optimaity to singular control problem.

Key words and phrases. Near-optimal singular stochastic control, Stochastic maximum principle, Necessary conditions, Ekeland's variational principle.

AMS Subject Classification: 60H10, 93E20.

---

[*] E-mail address: hafa.mokh@yahoo.com

[†] E-mail address: sabbas.iitk@gmail.com

[‡] E-mail address: panveverka@seznam.cz

1 Introduction

In this paper, we consider the singular stochastic control problem for systems governed by nonlinear controlled diffusion of the type

$$\begin{cases} dx_t = f\left(t, x_t, u_t\right) dt + \sigma\left(t, x_t, u_t\right) dW_t + G_t d\eta_t, \\ x_s = y, \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where $(W_t)_t$ is a standard $l-$dimentional Brownian motion defined on the filtered probability space $\left(\Omega, F, \left(F_t\right)_t, \mathbb{P}\right)$. The minimized criteria associated with the state equation (1.1) is defined by

$$J\left(s, y, u, \eta\right) = \mathbb{E}\left[h\left(x_T\right) + \int_s^T \ell\left(t, x_t, u_t\right) dt + \int_s^T k_t d\eta_t\right], \tag{1.2}$$

where $\mathbb{E}$ denotes the expectation with respect to $\mathbb{P}$, and the value function is defined as

$$V\left(s, y\right) = \inf_{(u,\eta)\in\mathbb{U}([s,T])} \left\{J\left(s, y, u, \eta\right)\right\}. \tag{1.3}$$

The kind of stochastic control problem has been investigated extensively, both by the Bellman's dynamic programming method [6] and by Pontryagin's maximum principle [18]. In this paper, we are concerned by th second method. Peng [17] introduced the second-order adjoint equation and obtained the global maximum principle of optimality, in which the control is present in the both drift and diffusion coefficients.Studying near-optimal controls makes a good sense as studying optimal controls from both theoretical as well as applications point of view. Many more near-optimal controls are available than optimal ones, indeed, optimal controls my not even exist in many situations, while near-optimal controls always exist. The near-optimal deterministic controls problem has been treated by many authors, including [12, 20, 21, 15]. Recently, in an interesting paper, Zhou [22] established the second-order necessary as well as sufficient conditions for near-optimal stochastic controls for general controlled diffusion with two adjoint processes. The near-optimal control problem for systems descripted by volterra integral equations has been studied by [16]. However, Chighoub et al., [8] extended Zhou's maximum principle of near-optimality to SDEs with jumps. The similar problem for systems driven by forward-backward stochastic differential equations has been solved in [5]. For justification of establishing a theory of near-optimal controls see ([22, 20], Introduction).

Singular stochastic control problem is an important and challenging class of problems in control theory, it appear in various fields like mathematical finance, problem of optimal consumption etc. Stochastic maximum principle for singular controls was considered by many authors, see for instance [1, 2, 7, 10, 11, 3, 13, 14]. The first version of maximum principle for singular stochastic control problems was obtained by Cadenillas et al., [7]. The first-order weak stochastic maximum principle has been studied in [3]. In [10] the authors derived stochastic maximum principle where the singular part has a linear form. Sufficient conditions for existence of optimal singular control have been obtained in [11].

The main objective of this paper is to establish necessary as well as sufficient conditions for near-optimal singular control for SDEs. The control domain is not necessarily convex. The proof of our result is based on Ekeland's variational principle [12], and some delicate estimates of the state and adjoint processes. Finally, as an illustration an example is solved explicitly. This result permit us to extend Zhou's maximum principle of near-optimality to singular control problem.

The paper is organized as follows. The assumptions and statment of the control problem is given in the second section. In the third and forth section, we establish the main result of this paper.

2 Assumptions and statement of the problem

We consider stochastic optimal control of the following kind. Let T be a fixed strictly positive real number and $(\Omega, F, \{F_t\}_t, \mathbb{P})$ be a fixed filtered probability space satisfying the usual conditions in which a $l-$dimentional Brownian motion $W = \{W_t : s \leq t \leq T\}$ with $s \in [0,T]$ and $W_s = 0$ is defined. Let $\mathbb{A}_1$ be a closed convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^m$ and $\mathbb{A}_2 := ([0,\infty))^m$. Let $\mathbb{U}_1$ be the class of measurable adapted processes $u : [s,T] \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_1$ and $\mathbb{U}_2$ is the class of measurable adapted processes $\eta : [0,T] \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_2$.

Definition 1. *An admissible control is a pair* (u,η) *of measurable* $\mathbb{A}_1 \times \mathbb{A}_2$-valued, F_t-*adapted processes, such that*

1) η *is of bounded variation, nondecreasing continuous on the left with right limits and* $\eta_s = 0$.

2) $\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{t\in[s,T]} |u_t|^2 + |\eta_T|^2\right] < \infty$.

We denote $\mathbb{U} = \mathbb{U}_1 \times \mathbb{U}_2$, the set of all admissible controls. Since $d\eta_t$ may be singular with respect to Lebesgue measure dt, we call η the singular part of the control and the process u its absolutely continuous part.

Throughout this paper, we also assume that

(H1) $f : [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{A}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $\sigma : [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{A}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{n\times l}(\mathbb{R})$ and ℓ :

$[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{A}_1\rightarrow\mathbb{R}$, are measurable in $(t,x,u,)$ and twice continuously differentiable in x, and there exists a constant $C>0$ such that, for $\varphi=f,\sigma,\ell$:

$$\left|\varphi(t,x,u,)-\varphi(t,x',u,)\right|+\left|\varphi_x(t,x,u,)-\varphi_x(t,x',u,)\right|\leq C\left|x-x'\right|. \tag{2.1}$$

$$|\varphi(t,x,u,)|\leq C\left(1+|x|\right). \tag{2.2}$$

(H2) $h:\mathbb{R}^n\rightarrow\mathbb{R}$ is twice continuously differentiable in x, and there exists a constant $C>0$ such that

$$\left|h(x)-h(x'))\right|+\left|h_x(x)-h_x(x'))\right|\leq C\left|x-x'\right|. \tag{2.3}$$

$$|h(x)|\leq C\left(1+|x|\right). \tag{2.4}$$

(H3) $G:[0,T]\rightarrow\mathcal{M}_{n\times m}\left(\mathbb{R}\right),\ k:[0,T]\rightarrow\left([0,\infty)\right)^m$, for each $t\in[0,T]:G$ is continuous and bounded, and k is continuous.

Under the above assumptions, the SDE (1.1) has a unique strong solution x_t which is given by

$$x_t=y+\int_s^t f\left(r,x_r,u_r\right)dr+\int_s^t\sigma\left(r,x_r,u_r\right)dW_r+\int_s^t G_r d\eta_r,$$

and by standard arguments it is easy to show that for any $q>0$, it hold that

$$\mathbb{E}(\sup_{t\in[s,T]}|x_t|^q)<C\left(q\right),$$

where $C\left(q\right)$ is a constant depending only on q and the functional J is well defined.
For any $(u,\eta)\in\mathbb{U}$ and the corresponding state trajectory x, we define the first-order adjoint process Ψ_t and the second-order adjoint process Q_t as the ones satisfying the following two backward SDEs respectively

$$\begin{cases} d\Psi_t=-\left[f_x^*\left(t,x_t,u_t\right)\Psi_t+\sigma_x^*\left(t,x_t,u_t\right)K_t+\ell_x\left(t,x_t,u_t\right)\right]dt \\ \qquad\quad +K_t dW_t, \\ \Psi_T=h_x\left(x_T\right), \end{cases} \tag{2.5}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} dQ_t = -\left[f_x^*\left(t,x_t,u_t\right)Q_t + Q_t f_x^*\left(t,x_t,u_t\right) + \sigma_x^*\left(t,x_t,u_t\right)Q_t\sigma_x^*\left(t,x_t,u_t\right)\right. \\ \qquad\qquad \left. +\sigma_x^*\left(t,x_t,u_t\right)R_t + R_t\sigma_x\left(t,x_t,u_t\right) + \Gamma_t\right]dt + R_t dW_t, \\ \Psi_T = h_{xx}\left(x_T\right), \end{cases} \tag{2.6}$$

where

$$\Gamma_t = \ell_{xx}\left(t,x_t,u_t\right) + \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\Psi_t^i f_{xx}^i\left(t,x_t,u_t\right) + K_t^i\sigma_{xx}^i\left(t,x_t,u_t\right)\right).$$

As is well known, under conditions (H1), (H2) and (H3) the first-order adjoint equation (2.5) admits one and only one $F-$adapted solution pair $(\Psi, K) \in \mathbb{L}_F^2\left([0,T],\mathbb{R}^n\right) \times \mathbb{L}_F^2\left([0,T],\mathbb{R}^n\right)$ and the second-order adjoint equation (2.6) admits one and only one $F-$adapted solution pair $(Q,R) \in \mathbb{L}_F^2\left([0,T],\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}\right) \times \mathbb{L}_F^2\left([0,T],\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}\right)$. Moreover, since f_x, σ_x, ℓ_x and h_x are bounded then we have the following estimate

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{s\leq t\leq T}\left|\Psi_t\right|^2 + \int_s^T \left|K_t\right|^2 dt + \sup_{s\leq t\leq T}\left|Q_t\right|^2 + \int_s^T \left|R_t\right|^2\right] \leq C.$$

Define the usual Hamiltonian

$$H\left(t,x,u,p,q\right) := -pf\left(t,x,u\right) - q\sigma\left(t,x,u\right) - \ell\left(t,x,u\right), \tag{2.7}$$

for $(t,x,u) \in [s,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{A}_1$. Furthermore, we define the $\mathcal{H}$ functional corresponding to a given admissible pair (x,u) as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}^{(x,u)}(t,x,u) &= H\left(t,x,u,\Psi_t,K_t - Q_t\sigma\left(t,x,u\right)\right) \\ &\quad -\frac{1}{2}\sigma^*\left(t,x,u\right)Q_t\sigma\left(t,x,u\right), \end{aligned}$$

for $(t,x,u,p,q) \in [s,T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{A}_1 \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$, where Ψ_t, K_t and Q_t are determined by adjoint equations (2.5) and (2.6) corresponding to (x,u).
Befor concluding this section, let us recall Ekeland variational principle and the Clarke's generalised gradient as follows

Lemma 1. (*Ekeland's Lemma [12]*) *Let* $(F,\ \rho)$ *be a complete metric space and* $f : F \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ *be a lower semi-continuous function which is bounded below. For a given* $\varepsilon > 0$*, suppose that* $u^\varepsilon \in F$ *satisfying* $f\left(u^\varepsilon\right) \leq \inf\left(f\right) + \varepsilon$*, then for any* $\lambda > 0$*, there exists* $u^\lambda \in F$ *such that*
1) $f\left(u^\lambda\right) \leq f\left(u^\varepsilon\right).$
2) $\rho\left(u^\lambda, u^\varepsilon\right) \leq \lambda.$

3) $f\left(u^{\lambda}\right) \leq f(u)+\dfrac{\varepsilon}{\lambda}\rho\left(u,u^{\lambda}\right)$ *for all* $u \in F$.

For $u, v \in \mathbb{U}$ To apply Ekeland's variational principle to our problem, we define a distance function ρ on the space of admissible controls such that $(\mathbb{U}, d)$ becomes a complete metric space. To achieve this goal, we define for any (u,η) and $(v,\xi) \in \mathbb{U}$:

$$d\left((u,\eta),(v,\xi)\right)=d_1(u,v)+d_2(\eta,\xi), \tag{2.8}$$

where

$$d_1(u,v)=\mathbb{P}\otimes dt\left\{(w,t)\in\Omega\times[0,T]: u(w,t)\neq v(w,t)\right\}, \tag{2.9}$$

and

$$d_2(\eta,\xi)=\left[\mathbb{E}(\sup_{t\in[s,T]}\left|\eta_t-\xi_t\right|^2)\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{2.10}$$

here $\mathbb{P}\otimes dt$ is the product measure of $\mathbb{P}$ with the Lebesgue measure dt on $[s,T]$. It is easy to see that $(\mathbb{U}_2, d_2)$ is a complete metric space. Moreover, it has been shown in Yong *et al.,* ([19] pp. 146-147) that $(\mathbb{U}_1, d_1)$ is a complete metric space. Hence $(\mathbb{U}, d)$ as a product of two complete metric spaces is a complete metric space under d.

Definition 1. (Clarke's generalized gradient [9]) Let E be a convex set in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and let $f: E \to \mathbb{R}$ be a locally Lipschitz function. The Clarke's generalized gradient of f at $x \in E$, denoted by $\partial_x f$, is a set defined by

$$\partial_x f(x)=\left\{\xi\in\mathbb{R}^n:\langle\xi,v\rangle\leq\limsup_{y\to x}\sup_{t\to 0}\frac{f(y+tv)-f(y)}{t}.\ \forall v\in\mathbb{R} \text{ and } y,\ \ (y+tv)\in E\right\}.$$

3 Necessary conditions for near-optimal singular control

Our purpose in this paper is to establish second-order necessary and sufficient conditions for near-optimal singular control for systems governed by nonlinear SDEs. It is worth montioning that optimal singular controls may not even exist in many situations, while near-optimal singular controls always exists. Ekeland's variational principle [12] is applied to prove our maximum principle. The proof follows the general ideas as in ([20, 21, 22]) where similar results are obtained for other class of controls.

We give the definition of near-optimal control as given in Zhou ([22], Definition 2.1 and Definition 2.2).

Definition 2. For a given $\varepsilon > 0$ the admissible control $(u^{\varepsilon}, \eta^{\varepsilon})$ is near-optimal if

$$\left|J\left(s, y, u^{\varepsilon}, \eta^{\varepsilon}\right) - V\left(s, y\right)\right| \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\varepsilon\right), \tag{3.1}$$

where $\mathcal{O}\left(.\right)$ is a function of ε satisfying $\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \mathcal{O}\left(\varepsilon\right) = 0$. The estimater $\mathcal{O}\left(\varepsilon\right)$ is called an error bound. If $\mathcal{O}\left(\varepsilon\right) = C\varepsilon^{\delta}$ for some $\delta > 0$ independent of the constant C then $(u^{\varepsilon}, \eta^{\varepsilon})$ is called near-optimal control with order ε^{δ}. If $\mathcal{O}\left(\varepsilon\right) = \varepsilon$ the admissible control $(u^{\varepsilon}, \eta^{\varepsilon})$ called $\varepsilon-$optimal.

Our first Lemma below, is deals with the continiuity of the state processes under distance ρ

Lemma 2. *If* $x_t^{u,\eta}$ *and* $x_t^{v,\eta}$ *be the solution of the state equation (1.1) associated respectively with* u and v. *For any* $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $\beta > 0$ satisfying $\alpha\beta < 1$, *there exists a positive constants* $C = C\left(T, \alpha, \beta\right)$ *such that*

$$\mathbb{E}(\sup_{s \leq t \leq T} \left| x_t^{u,\eta} - x_t^{v,\xi} \right|^{2\beta}) \leq C d_1^{\alpha\beta}\left(u, v\right). \tag{3.2}$$

Proof. First, we assume that $\beta \geq 1$. Using Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality for the martingale part, we can compute, for any $r \geq s$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{s \leq t \leq r} \left| x_t^{u,\eta} - x_t^{v,\xi} \right|^{2\beta}\right] &\leq C\mathbb{E}(\int_s^r \left\{ \left| f\left(t, x_t^{u,\eta}, u_t\right) - f\left(t, x_t^{v,\xi}, v_t\right) \right|^{2\beta} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \int_s^r \left| \sigma\left(t, x_t^{u,\eta}, u_t\right) - \sigma\left(t, x_t^{v,\xi}, v_t\right) \right|^{2\beta} \right\} dt \\
&\quad + C\mathbb{E}\left|\eta_T - \xi_T\right|^{2\beta}, \\
&\leq C\mathbb{E}(\int_s^r \left\{ \left| f\left(t, x_t^{u,\eta}, u_t\right) - f\left(t, x_t^{u,\eta}, v_t\right) \right|^{2\beta} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \int_s^r \left| \sigma\left(t, x_t^{u,\eta}, u_t\right) - \sigma\left(t, x_t^{u,\eta}, v_t\right) \right|^{2\beta} \right\} \boldsymbol{\chi}_{u_t \neq v_t}\left(t\right) dt \\
&\quad + C\mathbb{E}(\int_s^r \left\{ \left| f\left(t, x_t^{u,\eta}, v_t\right) - f\left(t, x_t^{u,\eta}, v_t\right) \right|^{2\beta} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \int_0^t \left| \sigma\left(t, x_t^{u,\eta}, v_t\right) - \sigma\left(t, x_t^{u,\eta}, v_t\right) \right|^{2\beta} \right\} \\
&\quad + C\mathbb{E}\left|\eta_T - \xi_T\right|^{2\beta},
\end{aligned}$$

now arguing as in ([22], Lemma 3.1) taking $b = \frac{1}{\alpha\beta} > 1$ and $a > 1$ such that $\frac{1}{a} + \frac{1}{b} = 1$, and applying Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\int_s^r \left|f\left(t,x_t^{u,\eta},u_t\right)-f\left(t,x_t^{u,\eta},v_t\right)\right|^{2\beta}\boldsymbol{\chi}_{u_t\neq v_t}(t)\,dt\\
\leq\ &\left\{\mathbb{E}\int_s^r \left|f\left(t,x_t^{u,\eta},u_t\right)-f\left(t,x_t^{u,\eta},v_t\right)\right|^{2\beta a}dt\right\}^{\frac{1}{a}}\times\left\{\mathbb{E}\int_s^r \boldsymbol{\chi}_{u_t\neq v_t}(t)\,dt\right\}^{\frac{1}{b}},
\end{aligned}$$

using definition of d_1 and linear growth condition on f we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\int_s^r \left|f\left(t,x_t^{u,\eta},u_t\right)-f\left(t,x_t^{u,\eta},v_t\right)\right|^{2\beta}\boldsymbol{\chi}_{u_t\neq v_t}(t)\,dt\\
\leq\ & C\left\{\mathbb{E}\int_s^r\left(1+\left|x_t^{u,\eta}\right|^{2\beta a}\right)dt\right\}^{\frac{1}{a}} d_1(u,v)^{\alpha\beta}\\
\leq\ & C d_1(u,v)^{\alpha\beta}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can prove

$$\mathbb{E}\int_s^r \left|\sigma\left(t,x_t^{u,\eta},u_t\right)-\sigma\left(t,x_t^{u,\eta},v_t\right)\right|^{2\beta}\boldsymbol{\chi}_{u_t\neq v_t}(t)\,dt\leq C d_1(u,v)^{\alpha\beta}. \tag{3.3}$$

Therefore, by using assumption (H1), we conclued that

$$\mathbb{E}\big(\sup_{s\leq t\leq r}\left|x_t^{u,\eta}-x_t^{v,\xi}\right|^{2\beta}\big)\leq C\left\{\mathbb{E}\int_s^r\sup_{s\leq r\leq\theta}\left|x_t^{u,\eta}-x_t^{v,\xi}\right|^{2\beta}d\theta+\mathbb{E}\left|\eta_T-\xi_T\right|^{2\beta}+d_1(u,v)^{\alpha\beta}\right\}.$$

Hence (3.1) follows immediately from definition 1 and Gronwall's inequality. Now we assume $0\leq\beta<1$. Since $\frac{2}{\alpha}>1$ then the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\big(\sup_{s\leq t\leq T}\left|x_t^{u,\eta}-x_t^{v,\xi}\right|^{2\beta}\big)\ &\leq\ \left[\mathbb{E}\big(\sup_{s\leq t\leq T}\left|x_t^{u,\eta}-x_t^{v,\xi}\right|^{2}\big)\right]^{\beta}\\
&\leq\ \left[C d_1(u,v)^{\alpha}\right]^{\beta}\\
&\leq\ C d_1(u,v)^{\alpha\beta}.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 2.

Lemma 3. *For any $0<\alpha<1$ and $1<\beta<2$ satisfying $(1+\alpha)\beta<2$, there exist a positive constant $C=C(\alpha,\beta)$* such that for any (u,η), $(v,\xi)\in\mathbb{U}([s,T])$, along with the correspending trajectories $x^{u,\eta}$, $x^{v,\xi}$ and the solutions (Ψ,K,Q,R), (Ψ',K',Q',R') *of the corresponding adjoint equations, it holds that*

$$\mathbb{E}\int_0^T \left(\left|\Psi_t-\Psi'_t\right|^{\beta} + \left|K_t-K'_t\right|^{\beta}\right)dt \quad \leq \quad Cd_1^{\frac{\alpha\beta}{2}}\left(u,v\right). \tag{3.4}$$

$$\mathbb{E}\int_0^T \left(\left|Q_t-Q'_t\right|^{\beta} + \left|R_t-R'_t\right|^{\beta}\right)dt \quad \leq \quad Cd_1^{\frac{\alpha\beta}{2}}\left(u,v\right). \tag{3.5}$$

Proof. Since the adjoint processes are independant to singular part, we use similar argument as in Zhou ([22] Lemma 3.2).

Now we are able to state and prove the necessary conditions for near-optimal singular control for our problem, which is the main result in this paper.

Let $(\Psi^{\varepsilon},K^{\varepsilon})$ *and* $(Q^{\varepsilon},R^{\varepsilon})$ *be the solution of adjoint equations (2.5) and (2.6) respectively corresponding to* $(x^{\varepsilon},(u^{\varepsilon},\eta^{\varepsilon}))$.

Theorem 1. *(Maximum principle for any near-optimal singular control). For any* $\delta\in(0,\frac{1}{3}]$*, and any near-optimal singular control* $(u^{\varepsilon},\eta^{\varepsilon})$ *there exists a positive constant* $C=C\left(\delta\right)$ *such that for each* $\varepsilon>0$

$$\left\{\begin{array}{c} -C\varepsilon^{\delta}\leq\mathbb{E}\int_s^T\left\{\frac{1}{2}\left(\sigma\left(t,x_t^{\varepsilon},u\right)-\sigma\left(t,x_t^{\varepsilon},u_t^{\varepsilon}\right)\right)^{*}Q_t^{\varepsilon}\left(\sigma\left(t,x^{\varepsilon},u\right)-\sigma\left(t,x_t^{\varepsilon},u_t^{\varepsilon}\right)\right)\right. \\ +\Psi_t^{\varepsilon}\left(f\left(t,x_t^{\varepsilon},u\right)-f\left(t,x_t^{\varepsilon},u_t^{\varepsilon}\right)\right)+K_t^{\varepsilon}\left(\sigma\left(t,x_t^{\varepsilon},u\right)-\sigma\left(t,x_t^{\varepsilon},u_t^{\varepsilon}\right)\right) \\ \left.+\left(\ell\left(t,x_t^{\varepsilon},u\right)-\ell\left(t,x_t^{\varepsilon},u_t^{\varepsilon}\right)\right)\right\}dt, \end{array}\right. \tag{3.6}$$

and

$$-C\varepsilon^{\delta}\leq\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^T(k_t+G_t^{*}\Psi_t^{\varepsilon})d\left(\eta-\eta^{\varepsilon}\right)_t\right]. \tag{3.7}$$

Proof. By using Ekeland's variational principle with $\lambda=\varepsilon^{\frac{2}{3}}$, there is an admissible pair $(\overline{x}^{\varepsilon},(\overline{u}^{\varepsilon},\overline{\eta}^{\varepsilon}))$ such that for any $(u,\eta)\in\mathbb{U}:$

$$\rho\left(\left(u^{\varepsilon},\eta^{\varepsilon}\right),\left(\overline{u}^{\varepsilon},\overline{\eta}^{\varepsilon}\right)\right)\leq\varepsilon^{\frac{2}{3}}. \tag{3.8}$$

and

$$J\left(s,y,u^{\varepsilon},\eta^{\varepsilon}\right)\leq J\left(s,y,u^{\varepsilon},\eta^{\varepsilon}\right)+\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}d\left(\left(u,\eta\right),\left(\overline{u}^{\varepsilon},\overline{\eta}^{\varepsilon}\right)\right).$$

Notice that $(u^{\varepsilon},\eta^{\varepsilon})$ which is near-optimal for the initial cost J defined in (1.2) is optimal for the new cost J^{ε} given by

$$J^{\varepsilon}\left(s,y,u,\eta\right)=J\left(s,y,u,\eta\right)+\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}d\left(\left(u,\eta\right),\left(\overline{u}^{\varepsilon},\overline{\eta}^{\varepsilon}\right)\right). \tag{3.9}$$

then we have

$$J^{\varepsilon}\left(s,y,\overline{u}^{\varepsilon},\overline{\eta}^{\varepsilon}\right)\leq J^{\varepsilon}\left(s,y,u,\eta\right)\text{ for any }\left(u,\eta\right)\in\mathbb{U}\left(\left[s,T\right]\right),$$

Next, we use the spike variation techniques for $\overline{u}^{\varepsilon}$to drive the first variational inequality and we use convex perturbation for $\overline{\eta}^{\varepsilon}$ as follows

First variational inequality: For any $\theta > 0$, we define the following strong perturbation $(\overline{u}_t^{\varepsilon,\theta}, \overline{\eta}_t^{\varepsilon}) \in \mathbb{U}$:

$$(\overline{u}^{\varepsilon,\theta}, \overline{\eta}_t^{\varepsilon}) = \begin{cases} (u, \overline{\eta}_t^{\varepsilon}), \, t \in [t_0, t_0 + \theta], \\ (\overline{u}_t^{\varepsilon}, \overline{\eta}_t^{\varepsilon}), \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{3.10}$$

The fact that

$$J^{\varepsilon}(s, y, \overline{u}^{\varepsilon}, \overline{\eta}^{\varepsilon}) \leq J^{\varepsilon}(s, y, \overline{u}^{\varepsilon,\theta}, \overline{\eta}^{\varepsilon}), \tag{3.11}$$

and

$$d((\overline{u}^{\varepsilon,\theta}, \overline{\eta}_t^{\varepsilon}), (\overline{u}^{\varepsilon}, \overline{\eta}_t^{\varepsilon})) = d_1(\overline{u}^{\varepsilon,\theta}, \overline{u}^{\varepsilon}) \leq \theta,$$

imply that

$$J(s, y, \overline{u}^{\varepsilon,\theta}, \overline{\eta}^{\varepsilon}) - J(s, y, \overline{u}^{\varepsilon}, \overline{\eta}^{\varepsilon}) \geq -\theta \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}.$$

Since the diference $J(s, y, \overline{u}^{\varepsilon,\theta}, \overline{\eta}^{\varepsilon})) - J(s, y, \overline{u}^{\varepsilon}, \overline{\eta}^{\varepsilon})$ is independant to the singular part, the near-maximum condition (3.6) follows by applying similar argument as in Zhou ([22]), we get

$$\begin{aligned} -C\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{3}} \leq \mathbb{E}\int_s^T \Big\{ & \tfrac{1}{2}\left(\sigma(t, \overline{x}_t^{\varepsilon}, u) - \sigma(t, \overline{x}_t^{\varepsilon}, \overline{u}_t^{\varepsilon})\right)^* \overline{Q}_t^{\varepsilon}\left(\sigma(t, \overline{x}^{\varepsilon}, u) - \sigma(t, \overline{x}_t^{\varepsilon}, \overline{u}_t^{\varepsilon})\right) \\ & + \overline{\Psi}_t^{\varepsilon}\left(f(t, \overline{x}_t^{\varepsilon}, u) - f(t, \overline{x}_t^{\varepsilon}, \overline{u}_t^{\varepsilon})\right) + \overline{K}_t^{\varepsilon}\left(\sigma(t, \overline{x}_t^{\varepsilon}, u) - \sigma(t, \overline{x}_t^{\varepsilon}, \overline{u}_t^{\varepsilon})\right) \\ & + \left(\ell(t, \overline{x}_t^{\varepsilon}, u) - \ell(t, \overline{x}_t^{\varepsilon}, \overline{u}_t^{\varepsilon})\right)\Big\} \, dt. \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

New we are to derive an estimate for the term similar to the right hand side of the abov inquality with all the $(\overline{x}_t^{\varepsilon}, (\overline{u}_t^{\varepsilon}, \overline{\eta}_t^{\varepsilon}))$ etc, replacing by $(x_t^{\varepsilon}, (u_t^{\varepsilon}, \eta_t^{\varepsilon}))$ etc. To this end, we use similar method as in Zhou ([22]) we obtian the following estimates:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\int_s^T & \left[\overline{K}_t^{\varepsilon}\left(\sigma(t, \overline{x}_t^{\varepsilon}, u) - \sigma(t, \overline{x}_t^{\varepsilon}, \overline{u}_t^{\varepsilon})\right)\right. \\ & \left. - K_t^{\varepsilon}\left(\sigma(t, x_t^{\varepsilon}, u) - \sigma(t, x_t^{\varepsilon}, u_t^{\varepsilon})\right)\right] dt \leq C\varepsilon^{\delta}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\int_s^T \Big\{ \tfrac{1}{2}\left(\sigma(t, \overline{x}_t^{\varepsilon}, u) - \sigma(t, \overline{x}_t^{\varepsilon}, \overline{u}_t^{\varepsilon})\right)^* \overline{Q}_t^{\varepsilon}\left(\sigma(t, \overline{x}^{\varepsilon}, u) - \sigma(t, \overline{x}_t^{\varepsilon}, \overline{u}_t^{\varepsilon})\right) \\ & -\tfrac{1}{2}\left(\sigma(t, x_t^{\varepsilon}, u) - \sigma(t, x_t^{\varepsilon}, u_t^{\varepsilon})\right)^* Q_t^{\varepsilon}\left(\sigma(t, x^{\varepsilon}, u) - \sigma(t, x_t^{\varepsilon}, u_t^{\varepsilon})\right) \\ & + \left[\overline{\Psi}_t^{\varepsilon}\left(f(t, \overline{x}_t^{\varepsilon}, u) - f(t, \overline{x}_t^{\varepsilon}, \overline{u}_t^{\varepsilon})\right) - \Psi_t^{\varepsilon}\left(f(t, x_t^{\varepsilon}, u) - f(t, x_t^{\varepsilon}, u_t^{\varepsilon})\right)\right] \\ & + \left[\ell(t, \overline{x}_t^{\varepsilon}, u) - \ell(t, \overline{x}_t^{\varepsilon}, \overline{u}_t^{\varepsilon})\right] - \left[\ell(t, x_t^{\varepsilon}, u) - \ell(t, x_t^{\varepsilon}, u_t^{\varepsilon})\right]\Big\} \, dt \\ & \leq C\varepsilon^{\delta}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

where $\left(\overline{\Psi}^{\varepsilon},\overline{K}^{\varepsilon}\right)$ and $\left(\overline{Q}^{\varepsilon},\overline{R}^{\varepsilon}\right)$ are the solutions of adjoint equations (2.5) and (2.6) respectively corresponding to $(\overline{x}^{\varepsilon},(\overline{u}^{\varepsilon},\overline{\eta}^{\varepsilon}))$. The first variational inequality (3.6) follows from combining, (3.12) (3.13) and.(3.14)

Corollary 1. Under the assumptions of Theorem 1, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\int_s^T \mathcal{H}^{(x^{\varepsilon},u^{\varepsilon})}(t,x_t^{\varepsilon},u_t^{\varepsilon})dt \geq \sup_{u\in\mathbb{U}([s,T])}\mathbb{E}\int_s^T \mathcal{H}^{(x^{\varepsilon},u^{\varepsilon})}(t,x_t^{\varepsilon},u_t)dt - C\varepsilon^{\delta}. \tag{3.15}$$

Second variational inequality: To obtain the second variational inequality, we define the following convex perturbation $(\overline{u}_t^{\varepsilon},\overline{\eta}_t^{\varepsilon,\theta})\in\mathbb{U}_1\times\mathbb{U}_2$:

$$(\overline{u}_t^{\varepsilon},\overline{\eta}_t^{\varepsilon,\theta}) = (\overline{u}_t^{\varepsilon},\overline{\eta}_t^{\varepsilon}+\theta\left(\xi-\overline{\eta}_t^{\varepsilon}\right)), \tag{3.16}$$

where ξ is an arbitrary element of the set $\mathbb{U}_2$. Using the optimality of $(\overline{u}^{\varepsilon},\overline{\eta}^{\varepsilon})$ to the new cost, J^{ε} we have

$$J^{\varepsilon}(s,y,\overline{u}^{\varepsilon},\overline{\eta}^{\varepsilon}) \leq J^{\varepsilon}(s,y,\overline{u}_t^{\varepsilon},\overline{\eta}_t^{\varepsilon,\theta}), \tag{3.17}$$

a simple computation on $d_2(\overline{u}_t^{\varepsilon},\overline{\eta}_t^{\varepsilon,\theta})$ we obtain

$$J(s,y,\overline{u}_t^{\varepsilon},\overline{\eta}_t^{\varepsilon,\theta}) - J\left(s,y,\overline{u}^{\varepsilon},\overline{\eta}^{\varepsilon}\right) \geq -C\theta\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{3}} \geq -C\theta\varepsilon^{\delta}.$$

Finally, arguing as in ([4]) for the left-hand side of the above inequality, then we have

$$\lim_{\theta\to 0}\frac{1}{\theta}\left[J(s,y,\overline{u}_t^{\varepsilon},\overline{\eta}_t^{\varepsilon,\theta}) - J\left(s,y,\overline{u}^{\varepsilon},\overline{\eta}^{\varepsilon}\right)\right] = \mathbb{E}\int_s^T (k_t+G_t^{*}\overline{\Psi}_t^{\varepsilon})d\left(\eta-\overline{\eta}^{\varepsilon}\right)_t,$$

then the near-singular maximum condition follows

$$-C\varepsilon^{\delta} \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\int_s^T (k_t+G_t^{\tau}\overline{\Psi}_t^{\varepsilon})d\left(\eta-\overline{\eta}^{\varepsilon}\right)_t\right]. \tag{3.18}$$

Now, we are to drive an estimate for the term similar to the right hand side of (3.18) with all $(\overline{x}^{\varepsilon},(\overline{u}^{\varepsilon},\overline{\eta}^{\varepsilon}))$ ect., replacing by $(x^{\varepsilon},(u^{\varepsilon},\eta^{\varepsilon}))$ ect. We first estimate the following difference:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\int_s^T (k_t+G_t^{*}\overline{\Psi}_t^{\varepsilon})d(\eta-\overline{\eta}^{\varepsilon})_t - \mathbb{E}\int_s^T (k_t+G_t^{*}\Psi_t^{\varepsilon})d(\eta-\eta^{\varepsilon})_t \\
= \;& \mathbb{E}\int_s^T G_t^{*}\left(\overline{\Psi}_t^{\varepsilon}-\Psi_t^{\varepsilon}\right)d\eta_t + \mathbb{E}\int_s^T (k_t+G_t^{*}\Psi_t^{\varepsilon})d\eta_t^{\varepsilon} \\
&-\mathbb{E}\int_s^T (k_t+G_t^{*}\overline{\Psi}_t^{\varepsilon})d\overline{\eta}_t^{\varepsilon}. \\
= \;& \mathbb{E}\int_s^T G_t^{*}\left(\overline{\Psi}_t^{\varepsilon}-\Psi_t^{\varepsilon}\right)d\left(\eta-\overline{\eta}^{\varepsilon}\right)_t + \mathbb{E}\int_s^T (k_t+G_t^{*}\Psi_t^{\varepsilon})d\left(\eta^{\varepsilon}-\overline{\eta}^{\varepsilon}\right)_t.
\end{aligned}$$

Using the boundness of G_t, k_t, Lemma3, definition 1 ($\eta_s = \eta_s^\varepsilon = \overline{\eta}_s^\varepsilon = 0$, $\mathbb{E}\left|\eta_T - \overline{\eta}_T^\varepsilon\right|^2 + \mathbb{E}\left|\eta_T^\varepsilon - \overline{\eta}_T^\varepsilon\right|^2 < \infty$) and the fact that $\mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{s\leq t\leq T}\left|\Psi_t^\varepsilon\right|^2\right) < C$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}\int_s^T (k_t + G_t^* \overline{\Psi}_t^\varepsilon) d(\eta - \overline{\eta}^\varepsilon)_t - \mathbb{E}\int_s^T (k_t + G_t^* \Psi_t^\varepsilon) d(\eta - \eta^\varepsilon)_t \leq C\varepsilon^\delta. \quad (3.19)$$

Combining (3.18) and (3.19) the proof of inequality (3.7) is complete.
Corollary 2. Under the assumptions of Theorem 1, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\int_s^T (k_t + G_t^* \Psi_t^\varepsilon) d\eta_t^\varepsilon \leq \inf_{\eta \in \mathbb{U}_2([s,T])} \mathbb{E}\int_s^T (k_t + G_t^* \Psi_t^\varepsilon) d\eta_t + C\varepsilon^\delta. \quad (3.20)$$

4 Sufficient near-optimality conditions

In this section, we will prove that under an additional assumptions, the near-maximum condition on the Hamiltonian function is sufficient for near-optimality. We assume:

(H4) ρ is differentiable in u for $\varphi = f, \sigma, \ell$ and there is a constante C such that

$$\left|\varphi(t,x,u,) - \varphi(t,x,u',)\right| + \left|\varphi_u(t,x,u,) - \varphi_u(t,x,u',)\right| \leq C\left|u - u'\right|. \quad (4.1)$$

Theorem 2. *Assume the* $H\left(t,\cdot,\cdot,\Psi_t^\varepsilon, K_t^\varepsilon\right)$ *is concave for a.e.* $t \in [s,T]$, $\mathbb{P} - a.s$, *and* h *is convex. Let* $\left(\Psi_t^\varepsilon, K_t^\varepsilon\right)$, $\left(Q_t^\varepsilon, R_t^\varepsilon\right)$ *be the solution of the adjoint equation (2.5)-(2.6) associated with* $\left(u^\varepsilon, \eta^\varepsilon\right)$. *If for some* $\varepsilon > 0$ *and for any* $(u, \eta) \in \mathbb{U}$:

$$\mathbb{E}\int_s^T \mathcal{H}^{(x^\varepsilon, u^\varepsilon)}(t, x_t^\varepsilon, u_t^\varepsilon) dt \geq \sup_{u \in \mathbb{U}_1([s,T])} \mathbb{E}\int_s^T \mathcal{H}^{(x^\varepsilon, u^\varepsilon)}(t, x_t^\varepsilon, u_t) dt - \varepsilon, \quad (4.2)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\int_s^T k_t d\left(\eta - \eta^\varepsilon\right)_t\right] \geq -C\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (4.3)$$

then we have

$$J\left(s, y, u^\varepsilon, \eta^\varepsilon\right) \leq \inf_{(u,\eta) \in \mathbb{U}([s,T])} J\left(s, y, u, \eta\right) + C\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (4.4)$$

where C *is a positive constant independent of* ε.

Proof. First, define the cost functional

$$J\left(s,y,u,\eta\right)=J_{1}\left(s,y,u\right)+J_{2}\left(s,\eta\right), \tag{4.5}$$

where

$$J_{1}\left(s,y,u\right)=\mathbb{E}\left[h\left(x_{T}\right)+\int_{s}^{T}\ell\left(t,x_{t},u_{t}\right)dt\right],$$

and

$$J_{2}\left(s,\eta\right)=\mathbb{E}\left[\int_{s}^{T}k_{t}d\eta_{t}\right].$$

Let us fix $\varepsilon>0$, Define a new metric $\widetilde{d}$ on $\mathbb{U}\left([s,T]\right)$ as follows: for any (u,η) and $(v,\xi)\in\mathbb{U}$:

$$\widetilde{d}\left(\left(u,\eta\right),\left(v,\xi\right)\right)=\widetilde{d_{1}}\left(u,v\right)+d_{2}\left(\eta,\xi\right),$$

where

$$\widetilde{d_{1}}\left(u,v\right)=\mathbb{E}\left[\int_{s}^{T}\varsigma_{t}^{\varepsilon}\left|u_{t}-v_{t}\right|dt\right], \tag{4.6}$$

and

$$\varsigma_{t}^{\varepsilon}=1+|\Psi_{t}^{\varepsilon}|+|K_{t}^{\varepsilon}|+|Q_{t}^{\varepsilon}|+|R_{t}^{\varepsilon}|\geq 1. \tag{4.7}$$

Obviously $\widetilde{d_{1}}$ is a metric on $(\mathbb{U}_{1},\widetilde{d_{1}})$, and it is a complete metric as a weighted $\mathbb{L}^{1}$ norm. Hence $(\mathbb{U},\widetilde{d})$ as a product of two complete metric spaces is a complete metric space under $\widetilde{d}$.
Define a functional Υ on $\mathbb{U}_{1}\left([s,T]\right)$ by

$$\begin{aligned}\Upsilon\left(u\right) &= \mathbb{E}\int_{s}^{T}H\left(t,x^{\varepsilon},u,\Psi^{\varepsilon},K^{\varepsilon},Q^{\varepsilon}\right)dt\\ &= \mathbb{E}\int_{s}^{T}\mathcal{H}^{\left(x^{\varepsilon},u^{\varepsilon}\right)}\left(t,x^{\varepsilon},u\right)dt,\end{aligned}$$

a simple computation shows that

$$\left|\Upsilon\left(u\right)-\Upsilon\left(v\right)\right|\leq C\mathbb{E}\left[\int_{s}^{T}\varsigma_{t}^{\varepsilon}\left|u_{t}-v_{t}\right|dt\right],$$

which implies that Υ is continuous on $\mathbb{U}_{1}\left([s,T]\right)$ with respct to $\widetilde{d_{1}}$. Now by using (4.2) and Ekeland variational principle, there exists a $\overline{u}^{\varepsilon}\in\mathbb{U}_{1}\left([s,T]\right)$ such that

$$\widetilde{d_{1}}(\overline{u}^{\varepsilon,},u^{\varepsilon})\leq\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}\int_s^T \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}(t, x_t^\varepsilon, \overline{u}_t^\varepsilon)dt = \max_{u \in \mathbb{U}_1([s,T])} \mathbb{E}\int_s^T \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}(t, x_t^\varepsilon, u_t)dt, \tag{4.8}$$

where

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}(t, x, u) = \mathcal{H}^{(x^\varepsilon, u^\varepsilon)}(t, x, u) - \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \varsigma_t^\varepsilon \left| u - \overline{u}_t^\varepsilon \right|. \tag{4.9}$$

The maximum condition (4.8) implies a pointwise maximum condition namely, for *a.e.* $t \in [s, T]$ and $\mathbb{P} - a.s$,

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}(t, x_t^\varepsilon, \overline{u}_t^\varepsilon) = \max_{u \in \mathbb{A}} \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}(t, x^\varepsilon, u).$$

Using Proposition A1 (Appendix), then we have

$$\partial_u \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}(t, x_t^\varepsilon, \overline{u}_t^\varepsilon) \ni 0.$$

Since $|u - \overline{u}_t^\varepsilon|$ is not differentiable in $\overline{u}_t^\varepsilon$ (locally Lipschitz), then we use Proposition A1 (Appendix) we get

$$\partial_u \left\{ \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \varsigma_t^\varepsilon \left| u - \overline{u}_t^\varepsilon \right| \right\} = \left[-\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \varsigma_t^\varepsilon,\ \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \varsigma_t^\varepsilon \right].$$

By using (4.9) and fact that the Clarke's generalized gradient of the sum of two functions is contained in the sum of the Clarke's generalized gradient of the two functions, we get

$$\partial_u \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}(t, x_t^\varepsilon, \overline{u}_t^\varepsilon) \subset \partial_u \mathcal{H}^{(x^\varepsilon, u^\varepsilon)}(t, x_t^\varepsilon, \overline{u}_t^\varepsilon) + \left[-\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \varsigma_t^\varepsilon,\ \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \varsigma_t^\varepsilon \right].$$

Applying the similar method as in ([22]) for the rest of the proof, we obtian, for an arbitrary u

$$J_1\left(s, y, u^\varepsilon\right) \leq J_1\left(s, y, u\right) + C\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{4.10}$$

Now, by using (4.3) we get

$$\begin{aligned} J_2\left(s, \eta^\varepsilon\right) &= \mathbb{E}\left[\int_s^T k_t d\eta_t^\varepsilon\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\int_s^T k_t d\eta_t\right] + C\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that for an arbitrary η

$$J_2\left(s, \eta^\varepsilon\right) \leq J_2\left(s, \eta\right) + C\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{4.11}$$

Combining (4.10), (4.11) and (4.5) we arrive at

$$J\left(s,y,u^{\varepsilon},\eta^{\varepsilon}\right)\leq J\left(s,y,u,\eta\right)+C\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Since (u,η) is arbitrary, the desired result follows.

Corollary 3. Let the assumptions of Theorem 2 holds. A sufficient conditions for an admissible pair $(x^{\varepsilon},u^{\varepsilon},\eta^{\varepsilon})$ to be $\varepsilon-$optimal is

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\left\{\int_s^T\mathcal{H}^{(x^{\varepsilon},u^{\varepsilon})}(t,x_t^{\varepsilon},u_t^{\varepsilon})dt-\int_s^T k_t d\eta_t^{\varepsilon}\right\}\\ \geq\ &\sup_{(u,\eta)\in\mathbb{U}([s,T])}\mathbb{E}\left\{\int_s^T\mathcal{H}^{(x^{\varepsilon},u^{\varepsilon})}(t,x_t^{\varepsilon},u_t)dt-\int_s^T k_t d\eta_t\right\}-\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{C}\right)^2.\end{aligned}$$

Example 1. Consider the one-dimensional stochastic control problem: $n=l=1$, $G_t=1$, $\mathbb{A}_1=[0,1]$, $\mathbb{A}_2=[0,1]$, $\eta_1=1$,

$$\begin{cases}dx_t=u_t dW_t+d\eta_t,\\ x_0=0,\end{cases}\tag{4.12}$$

and the cost functional being

$$J\left(s,y,u,\eta\right)=\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{2}x_1^2-\int_0^1 u_t dt+\int_0^1 k_t d\eta_t\right],\tag{4.13}$$

For a given admissible pair $(x^{\varepsilon},(u^{\varepsilon},\eta^{\varepsilon}))$, the corresponding second-order adjoint equation is

$$\begin{cases}dQ_t^{\varepsilon}=R_t^{\varepsilon}dW_t\\ Q_1^{\varepsilon}=1,\end{cases}\tag{4.14}$$

By the uniqueness of this solution, $(Q^{\varepsilon},R^{\varepsilon})=(1,0)$, then for any admissible control (u,η) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}^{(x^{\varepsilon},u^{\varepsilon})}(t,x_t^{\varepsilon},u_t)&=u_t-\left(K_t^{\varepsilon}-Q_t^{\varepsilon}u_t^{\varepsilon}\right)u_t-\tfrac{1}{2}Q_t^{\varepsilon}u_t^2\\&=\tfrac{1}{2}\left[\left(u_t^{\varepsilon}-K_t^{\varepsilon}+1\right)^2-\left(u_t-u_t^{\varepsilon}+K_t^{\varepsilon}-1\right)^2\right].\end{aligned}$$

Replacing $u_t=u_t^{\varepsilon}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}^{(x^{\varepsilon},u^{\varepsilon})}(t,x_t^{\varepsilon},u_t^{\varepsilon})&=\tfrac{1}{2}\left[\left(u_t^{\varepsilon}-\left(K_t^{\varepsilon}-1\right)\right)^2-\left(K_t^{\varepsilon}-1\right)^2\right]\\&=\tfrac{1}{2}\left[\left(u_t^{\varepsilon}\right)^2+2u_t^{\varepsilon}\left(1-K_t^{\varepsilon}\right)\right].\end{aligned}$$

Hence by simple computation shows that if

$$u_t^{\varepsilon}-\left(K_t^{\varepsilon}-1\right)\in\left[0,1\right],\tag{4.15}$$

then (3.15) and (3.20) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\int_0^1 \tfrac{1}{2}\left[(u_t^\varepsilon)^2 + 2u_t^\varepsilon\,(1-K_t^\varepsilon)\right]dt \\
\geq\ & \sup_{u\in[0,1]}\mathbb{E}\int_0^1 \tfrac{1}{2}\left[(u_t^\varepsilon - K_t^\varepsilon + 1)^2 - (u_t - u_t^\varepsilon + K_t^\varepsilon - 1)^2\right]dt - C\varepsilon^\delta,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}\int_s^T (k_t+\Psi_t^\varepsilon)d\eta_t^\varepsilon \leq \inf_{\eta\in\mathbb{U}_2([s,T])}\mathbb{E}\int_s^T (k_t+\Psi_t^\varepsilon)d\eta_t + C\varepsilon^\delta,$$

thus

$$\mathbb{E}\int_0^1 (K_t^\varepsilon - 1)^2\,dt \leq C\varepsilon^\delta. \tag{4.16}$$

We denote $\mathfrak{B} = \left\{(w,t)\in\Omega\times[0,1] : k_t+\Psi_t^\varepsilon \geq -C\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}\right\}$ and define

$$d\eta_t = \begin{cases} 0 \text{ if } k_t+\Psi_t^\varepsilon \geq -C\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ d\eta_t^\varepsilon \text{ otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

Hence a simple calculation shows that

$$\mathbb{E}\int_0^1 (k_t+\Psi_t^\varepsilon)d\,(\eta-\eta^\varepsilon)_t = \mathbb{E}\int_0^1 (k_t+\Psi_t^\varepsilon)\boldsymbol{\chi}_{\mathfrak{B}}d\,(-\eta^\varepsilon)_t \geq -C\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

which implies that

$$\mathbb{E}\int_0^1 (k_t+\Psi_t^\varepsilon)\boldsymbol{\chi}_{\mathfrak{B}}d\eta_t^\varepsilon \leq C\varepsilon^\delta \tag{4.17}$$

It worth montioning that the above conditions reveals the minimum qualification for the pair $(x^\varepsilon,(u^\varepsilon,\eta^\varepsilon))$ to be $\varepsilon-$optimal. As an example, the admissible controls $(u^\varepsilon,\eta^\varepsilon) = (1-\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}},\eta^\varepsilon)$ are condidate $\varepsilon-$optimality, where $\varepsilon>0$ is sufficiently small. Note that the first-order adjoint equation is

$$\begin{cases} d\Psi_t^\varepsilon = K_t^\varepsilon dW_t \\ \Psi_1^\varepsilon = x_1^\varepsilon, \end{cases} \tag{4.18}$$

with the corresponding trajectories $x_t^\varepsilon = (1-\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}})W_t + \eta_t^\varepsilon$ then the unique solution pair of the first-order adjoint equation will be $(\Psi_t^\varepsilon, K_t^\varepsilon) = \left((1-\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}})W_t + 1, (1-\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}})\right)$.
Hence (4.15) and (4.16) will be satisfied.
Conversely, for the sufficient part, since the hamiltonian $H\,(t,x,u,p,q) = u - qu$ is concave in (x,u), we use Theorem 1 to conclude that $u_t^\varepsilon = (1-\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{C}\right)^2)$ is a condidate to be $\varepsilon-$optimality for sufficiently small ε is indeed an $\varepsilon-$optimal control.

Appendix

The following result gives some basic properties of the Clarke's gneralized gradient.

Proposition A1. If $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is locally Lipschitz at $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then the following statements holds

(1) $\partial_x f(x)$ is nonempty, compact, and convex set in $\mathbb{R}^n$
(2) $\partial_x(-f)(x) = -\partial_x(f)(x)$,
(3) $0 \in \partial_x(f)(x)$ if f attains a local minimum or maximum at x
(4) If f is Frêchet-differentiable at x, then $\partial_x f(x) = \{f'(x)\}$.
(5) If f, $g : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ are locally Lipschitz at $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, then

$$\partial_x(f+g)(x) \subset \partial_x f(x) + \partial_x g(x).$$

See ([19] Lemma 2.3), [9] for the detailed proof of the above Proposition. As an example, the Clarke's generalized gradient of the absolute value function $f : x \mapsto |x|$ which is continuously differentiable everywhere except at 0. Since $f'(x) = 1$ for $x > 0$ and, $f'(x) = -1$ for $x < 0$ then the Clarke's generalized gradient of f at $x = 0$ is given by

$$\partial_x f(0) = \overline{co}\{-1, 1\} = [-1, 1],$$

References

[1] L. H.R. Alvarez, *A class of solvable singular stochastic control problems,* Stochastics, Stochastics Rep., 67, (1999), 83-122.

[2] L. H.R. Alvarez, *Singular stochastic control linear diffusion and optimal stopping: A class of solvable problems,* SIAM J. Contr. Optim., 39 (2001), pp. 1697-1710.

[3] S. Bahlali, and A. Chala, *The stochastic maximum principle in optimal control of singular diffusions with non linear coefficients*, Random Oper. and Stoch. Equ. (ROSE), (2005) pp. 1-10.

[4] S. Bahlali and B. Mezerdi, *A general stochastic maximum principle for singular control problems* Electronic J. Probab. 10, (2005), 988–1004.

[5] K. Bahlali, N. Khelfallah, and B. Mezerdi, *Necessary and sufficient conditions for near optimality in stochastic control of FBSDEs.* System and Control Letters 58, (2009). pp. 857-864.

[6] R. Bellman, *Dynamic programming,* Princeton Univ. Press., (1957).

[7] A. Cadenillas, and U. Haussman, *The stochastic maximum principle for singular control problem,* Stochastics, Stochastics rep.,V 49, N 3-4,. pp. 211-237 (1994).

[8] F. Chighoub and B. Mezerdi, *Near optimality conditions in stochastic control of jump diffusion processes,* Systems & control letters 60 (2011) 907–916.

[9] F.H. Clarke, *Optimization and Nonsmooth Analysis,* Wiley, New York, (1983).

[10] F. Dufour, and B. Miller, *Maximum principle for singular stochastic control problem.* Siam J. Control Optim, Vol. 45. No. 2 pp. 668-698 (2006).

[11] F. Dufour, and B. Miller, *Singular stochastic control problem.* Siam J. Control Optim, Vol. 43. No. 2 pp. 705-730 (2004).

[12] I. Ekeland, *On the variational principle,* J. Math. Anal. Appl. 47, (1974), .pp. 443-474

[13] U.G. Haussmann, and W. Suo, *Singular optimal control I, II*, SIAM J. Contr. Optim., Vol. 33, N 3, (1995) pp. 916-936, 937-959.

[14] I. Karatzas, D. Ocone, H. Wang, and M. Zervos. *Finite-fuel singular control with discretionary stopping.* Stochastics stochastic rep., 71 (2000), pp. 1-50.

[15] R. Gabasov, M. Kirillova and B.S. Mordukhovich, *The* $\varepsilon-$*maximum principle for suboptimal controls,* Soviet Math Dokh N 27 (1983), pp. 95-99.

[16] L. P. Pan and K.L. Teo, *Near-Optimal Controls of Class of volterra Integral Systems,* J. Optimal control Theory Appli., Vol 101, No 2, (1999) pp. 355-373.

[17] S. Peng, *A general stochastic maximum principle for optimal control problems.* SIAM J. Contr. Optim. 28, N° 4 (1990), pp. 966-979.

[18] L.S., Pontryagin's, V.G., Boltanskii, R.V, Gamkrelidze, *The mathematical theory of optimal processes.* Inter-scien. N.Y., (1962).

[19] J. Yong, and X. Y. Zhou, *Stochastic Controls. Hamiltonian Systems and HJB Equations.* Springer-Verlag. New York, (1999).

[20] X.Y. Zhou *Deterministic near-optimal controls. Part I: Necessary and sufficient conditions for near optimality,* J. Optim. Theory Appl. 85, (1995), 473-488.

[21] X.Y. Zhou *Deterministic near-optimal controls. Part II: Dynamic programming and viscosity solution approach,* Mathematics of Operations Research, Vol 21, (1996), 655-674.

[22] X.Y. Zhou *Stochastic near-optimal controls: Necessary and sufficient conditions for near-optimality,* SIAM. Control. Optim. 36, (1998), 929-947.